

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
PENNSYLVANIA HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION

GERALD M. STANCIL and DELLA STANCIL, :
his wife, :

Complainants :

vs. :

DOCKET NO. H- 977

SPANO REAL ESTATE CO., INC., MARY :
JANE MANSOR and JOHN T. MAILLIE, :
Respondents :

OPINION, INCLUDING FINDINGS OF
FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, COMMISS-
SION'S DECISION and FINAL ORDER

On December 7, 1967 the complainants, Gerald M. Stancil and Della Stancil, his wife, Negroes, filed a verified complaint with the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission (hereinafter referred to as "Commission"), charging that Spano Real Estate Co., Inc. (hereinafter referred to as "Spano") and Mary Jane Mansor (hereinafter referred to as "Mansor"), its agent, had discriminated against them by reason of their race when they applied for the rental of premises 2743 Quaint Street, Secane, Delaware County, Pennsylvania. This complaint was amended on December 12, 1967 by adding John T. Maillie (hereinafter referred to as "Maillie"), owner of the said premises, as a party respondent.

Investigation of the facts in the case resulted in a finding of probable cause to credit the allegations of the complaint and the Commission ordered that a public hearing be conducted by Hearing Commissioners Joseph X. Yaffe, Esq., presiding, Rev. Arnold D. Nearn, Everett E. Smith and Dr. Robert Johnson Smith.

Two days of public hearings were conducted on February 16, 1968 and on March 8, 1968 in the Radnor Township Administration Building, 301 Iven Avenue, Wayne, Delaware County, Pennsylvania.

The case in support of the complaint was presented by Nathan Agran, Esq., General Counsel for the Commission. All respondents were present, testified and were represented by counsel. Max W. Gibbs, Esq., represented the respondents Spano and Mansor. The respondent Maillie was represented by Leonard Sugerman, Esq.

The evidence discloses that prior to the time that the Commission authorized the public hearing the Commission's representative agreed with the respondent Maillie, owner of the premises in question, to adjust the matter amicably and that said respondent did, in fact, comply with the terms of such adjustment. The Hearing Commissioners therefore recommend to the Commission that the complaint against the respondent Maillie be marked terminated on the ground that after a finding of probable cause but prior to the public hearing, the matter was adjusted amicably with him.

On the basis of the evidence at the hearing, the Hearing Commissioners recommend that the Commission enter cease and desist orders against the respondents Spano and Mansor, requiring them to deal on an equal basis with all individuals desiring to rent or purchase commercial housing from or through them without discrimination because of the race or color of such individuals.

The Hearing Commissioners further recommend that the respondent, Spano, its officers and agents, be required to cease and desist from disclosing to persons listing commercial housing with them the race of a prospective renter or buyer of such commercial housing and should also be required to cease and desist from attempting to prevent any individual from filing a complaint with the Commission pursuant to the provisions of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act.

The Hearing Commissioners make the following findings of fact and conclusions of law :

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The complainants herein, Gerald M. Stancil and Della Stancil, his wife, are Negroes who at the time of the filing of the complaint resided in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
2. The respondent, Spano, is a Pennsylvania corporation acting as a real estate firm with principal office at 428 Baltimore Pike, Springfield, Pennsylvania. It is a licensed real estate firm authorized to transact business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.
3. The officers of Spano are Robert Graham, president, Mildred McDaniel, secretary-treasurer, and Vincent A. Spano, chairman of the Board of Directors; and the said Vincent A. Spano and Robert Graham comprise the Board of Directors of Spano.
4. At all times mentioned, the respondent Mansor, Caucasian, was the duly authorized agent of Spano.
5. The respondent, Maillie, Caucasian, resided at 910 High Street, Pottstown, Pennsylvania and at R.D. 1, Birdsboro, Pennsylvania, at the times mentioned herein and was the true and registered owner of premises 2743 Quaint Street, Secane, Delaware County, Pennsylvania.
6. On August 23, 1967, by written contract, Maillie gave Spano a ninety day exclusive right to sell his property at 2743 Quaint Street, Secane, Pennsylvania for \$15,000.00. During September of 1967, when it appeared that the property was not being sold, Maillie agreed orally to permit Spano to attempt to rent the said property.
7. On November 26, 1967, the wife complainant saw an advertisement

in the Sunday edition of the Philadelphia Bulletin whereby the respondent Spano offered to rent a three bedroom house in Drexel Hill for \$125.00 per month.

8. On Monday, November 27, 1967, the wife complainant called Spano's telephone number as listed in the newspaper advertisement, spoke with the respondent Mansor and made an appointment with Mansor to see the advertised property on Tuesday, November 28, 1967.

9. On Tuesday, November 28, 1967, Mansor showed complainants the advertised property and when complainants advised Mansor they were dissatisfied they asked Mansor whether there were any other houses available for rent in that general area, whereupon Mansor advised there was one other house at 2743 Quaint Street, Secane, Pennsylvania available for rent at \$170.00 per month.

10. On the same day, November 28, 1967, Mansor showed complainants premises 2743 Quaint Street, Secane, Pennsylvania and complainants agreed to rent said dwelling, approved a written application therefor as prepared by Mansor and left a deposit of \$30.00 therefor with Spano. By said application, complainants agreed to pay rent at \$170.00 per month beginning December 1, 1967, complainants to take possession by December 11, 1967.

11. In the late afternoon of the following day, November 29, 1967 the husband complainant, at the request of Mansor, returned to Spano's office and signed the said application, he having neglected to sign it on the previous day.

12. On or about November 28, 1967, said premises 2743 Quaint Street, Secane, Pennsylvania was an unoccupied dwelling intended to be occupied by one family for residence purposes.

13. At the time complainants applied for rental of said premises,

their gross annual earnings amounted to \$16,386.00.

14. Thereafter, complainants continued to make inquiries of the respondents, Spano and Mansor, to determine whether a credit check which respondents claimed to have ordered was satisfactory and whether the application which respondents claimed was forwarded to the owner, Maillie, had been approved by the owner. Such inquiries were made on Thursday, November 30, 1967; on Friday, December 1, 1967; on Monday, December 4, 1967; and by personal appearances at Spano's office on Tuesday, December 5, 1967. On each of said occasions, respondents Spano and Mansor advised complainants that the credit report had not yet been given by the credit company and that the owner had not yet indicated whether he approved the application.

15. Despite assurances by respondents Spano and Mansor that there had been no word yet received from the credit company, said credit report had been ordered orally by said respondents on November 30, 1967 and the credit company had advised orally that the credit of the complainants was satisfactory. The written credit report, however, was not forwarded to Spano by the credit company until December 8, 1967 and was not received in Spano's office until December 11, 1967.

16. Despite assurances by Spano to the complainants that complainants' application had been forwarded to the owner of premises 2743 Quaint Street, Secane, Pennsylvania, such application was not so forwarded until December 7, 1967, although on December 4, 1967, the owner was orally advised by Spano that such an application had been made by complainants.

17. During the period November 28, 1967 through December 1, 1967, Mrs. Naomi Marcus, Caucasian, pursuant to the program of the Upper Darby-Lansdowne Fair Housing Council of which she is a member, tested the practices of the respondents Spano and Mansor by representing herself to be desirous of renting for herself and family the house advertised by Spano in the Sunday

Bulletin of November 26, 1967.

18. During the said testing period, when the tester, Mrs. Marcus, indicated that she was not satisfied with the house advertised for rent and asked what other houses were available for rent in the same general area, Mansor offered to show Mrs. Marcus six other houses being offered for rent by Spano --- viz., two houses in Glendlden, one in Folcroft, a house on Blythe Avenue in Drexel Hill, a house in Wawa and the house in Secane at 2743 Quaint Street.

19. On December 1, 1967, the tester Mrs. Marcus was shown premises 2743 Quaint Street, Secane, by Mansor and when Mrs. Marcus indicated she liked the dwelling, Mansor and the tester jointly filled out an application therefor for the monthly rental of \$165.00. At that time, Mansor told the tester to have the application executed by the tester and her husband, Mansor's signature having already been placed thereon, and to return the application as thus executed to Spano's office together with a deposit of \$30.00.

20. On December 1, 1967 when Mansor advised the tester to execute the application and return it to Spano's office with a deposit, she explained to the tester that a previous application for the same property had been filed with Spano (referring to complainants' application), but that "she was quite certain that this application would not go through."

21. Respondents Spano and Mansor offered to rent premises 2743 Quaint Street, Secane, Pennsylvania to the white tester, Naomi Marcus, for \$165.00 per month whereas three days earlier, on November 28, 1967, the said respondents had asked the Negro complainants for \$170.00 per month for the same property.

22. On December 4, 1967 Spano advised Maillie in a telephone conversation that the complainant applicants were Negroes.

23. During the same conversation of December 4, 1967 Spano suggested to Maillie that Maillie would not have to rent to complainants on the ground that complainants have children who are not supervised since the wife complainant works at night. At no time was Spano told that the said children would be left without supervision and Spano had no facts upon which otherwise to assume that complainants' children would be left without supervision.

24. Complainants have three children, ages 10, 9 and 7. At the time of the filing of the complaint, both complainants worked, one during the day and the other during the night. At the time of the public hearing, only the husband complainant worked, the wife complainant having voluntarily discontinued her employment.

25. As the result of the December 4, 1967 telephone conversation between Spano and the owner, Spano was advised by the owner that the owner did not want to rent the house but desired to sell it. Maillie was asked to confirm his refusal to rent in writing and consequently wrote a letter to Spano dated December 5, 1967 confirming the telephone conversation and advising that the house was for sale only and not for rent.

26. On December 5, 1967, the owner Maillie, thus advised Spano he did not desire to rent premises 2743 Quaint Street, Secane, Pennsylvania, but this was never related to complainants by Spano or Mansor and complainants was so advised by communication from Maillie to the Commission, a copy of which was forwarded to complainants, said communication being dated December 12, 1967.

27. The complaint in this case was properly signed and sworn to before a Notary Public on December 7, 1967 and was amended on December 12, 1967 to add John T. Maillie as a party respondent. At the hearing, the complaint was further amended to show violations by the respondent Spano of Sections 5(e) and 5(h) of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act.

28. On December 12, 1967, Maillie agreed with the Commission's representative to permit complainants to have the first opportunity to purchase premises 2743 Quaint Street, Secane, Pennsylvania for the new asking price of \$14,500.00; and further to rent said house to complainants in the event he was unable to sell the house and decided to return the house to the rental market. Maillie wrote a communication to that effect, dated December 12, 1967 to the Commission with a copy thereof to the complainants.

29. During the first week of January 1968, Maillie contacted the complainants and offered to sell the said property to complainants. When such offer was refused, Maillie sold the property to James and Helen Kelly by Agreement of Sale dated January 13, 1968 for \$ 14,300.00.

30. On December 18, 1967 the husband complainant advised Mansor by telephone that he had received a communication from the owner Maillie to the effect that the Quaint Street property was no longer for rent but was for sale only. At that time, the husband complainant demanded return of the \$30.00 deposit he had left with Mansor and Spano.

31. On December 18, 1967 Mildred McDaniel, secretary-treasurer of Spano, prepared a communication for the signature of Robert Graham, president of Spano with an enclosed check to the order of complainants in the sum of \$30.00 representing return of the deposit, but said president refused to sign the said communication and refused to return the deposit to the complainants unless complainants would agree to discontinue the complaint filed by them with the Commission against Spano and Mansor.

32. The \$30.00 deposit given to Spano by complainants on November 28, 1967 had not been returned to the complainants by Spano at the time of the hearings of the present complaint. On January 12, 1968, Spano, acting by its president, Robert Graham, wrote to complainants and offered to return the \$30.00 on condition that complainants would execute a written form agreeing to discontinue their complaint against Mansor and Spano which complainants had

filed with the Commission. This the complainants were unwilling to do.

33. During the period covered by the instant complaint and for some time prior thereto, the president of Spano gave instructions to all employees of Spano to refuse to discuss any complaint against Spano with representatives of the Commission except with his consent and under his instructions.

34. During the period covered by the instant complaint and for a long time prior thereto, Spano used a printed Application for Rental form which all applicants for rental of any commercial housing listed by Spano are required to sign, containing a clause to the effect that in the event the rental application is refused, applicants may not file any charges or complaints with the Commission. The exact language of the clause is:

" In the event application is refused, applicant
agree that no charges or complaints of any nature will be
filed with any agency whatsoever by said applicant."

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. At the time of the grievances complained of in the instant case, premises 2743 Quaint Street, Secane, Delaware County, Pennsylvania, was an unoccupied dwelling intended to be occupied by one family for residence purposes and was therefore "commercial housing" within the meaning of that term in 4(j) of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act.

2. At all times herein mentioned, the Commission had and still has jurisdiction over the respondents.

3. At all times herein mentioned, the Commission had and still has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this proceeding and over the complaint.

4. The complaint and amended complaint were properly made, signed and filed in accordance with Section 9 of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act.

5. During the period covered by the instant complaint, the respondent, Mary Jane Mansor, committed unlawful discriminatory practices under Section 5(h) of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act by requesting a higher monthly rental from the complainant Negroes for premises 2743 Quaint Street, Secane, Pennsylvania than from the white tester applicant, Mrs. Naomi Marcus; by representing to complainants that their application for rental of said premises had been forwarded to the owner when in fact it had not been so forwarded; by representing to complainants that the credit company had not yet rendered its report relative to complainants when in fact it had rendered a favorable credit report; and by advising complainants that the company for which she worked did not have other properties available for rent when in fact there were other such properties which she could have shown to complainants.

6. During the period covered by the instant complaint, the respondent, Spano Real Estate Co., Inc. committed unlawful discriminatory practices under Sections 5(e) and 5(h) of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act by revealing the race of the complainants to the owner of premises 2743 Quaint Street, Secane, Pennsylvania at the time it informed the owner that complainants had applied for rental of said property; by permitting one of its agents to request a higher rental for said property than the rental requested of a white applicant; by improperly suggesting to the owner of said property at the time it revealed the race of complainants that the owner did not have to rent to complainants on the ground that complainants' children were not being supervised; by permitting one of its agents to conceal from the Negro complainants dwellings listed with it and available for rent to the general public; by refusing to return the \$30.00 deposit left by complainants with it as a deposit on account of the rental of the

property at 2743 Quaint Street, Secane, Pennsylvania unless and until complainants would agree to discontinue and/or withdraw their complaint filed with the Commission against it and against its agent, Mary Jane Mansor; by refusing to permit its agents to be interviewed by representatives of the Commission investigating a complaint pursuant to the Human Relations Act after such complaint had been filed with the Commission naming it as a respondent; and by using printed application for rental forms and requiring all applicants to sign same, whereby such applicants are barred from filing a charge or complaint with the Commission in the event their applications are refused.

7. The respondents, Spano Real Estate Co., Inc. and Mary Jane Mansor committed unlawful discriminatory practices under Section 5(h) of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act in that said respondents dealt in a discriminatory manner with the complainants, Gerald M. and Della Stancil, applicants for rental of commercial housing, because of complainants' race or color.

As stated earlier, the Hearing Commissioners recommend that the case against the respondent owner, Maillie, be marked closed on the ground that the complaint against him was adjusted amicably prior to giving notice of the public hearing in this case. The evidence is to the effect that on December 4, 1967, Maillie orally took his property off of the rental market and confirmed this in writing to the respondent Spano on December 5, 1967. A week later, on December 12, 1967 Maillie offered to sell his property to complainants and agreed at the same time to permit complainants the first opportunity to rent the property if he were to

return the property to the rental market at any future time.

The Hearing Commissioners are unanimously of the opinion that the respondents Spano and Mansor dealt with the complainants in a discriminatory manner on account of their race and therefore violated the provisions of the Human Relations Act. It is therefore recommended that the Commission enter appropriate cease and desist orders against these respondents.

The respondent Mansor, within a three day period, quoted a monthly rental of \$170.00 to the Negro complainants and \$165.00 to the white applicant, Mrs. Naomi Marcus, for the same dwelling. It must be assumed that this was done with the knowledge and approval of Mansor's employer, Spano. In any event, the employer is fully responsible for its agent's actions. Even the owner, Maillie, recognized that this was an act of discrimination against the complainants on account of their race. He testified at pages 324 and 325 of the record, as follows:

"Q. Did you say anything in response to this ?

A. Actually I was upset about this whole affair, because I thought the rent at \$165 was too high and here we have \$170....

.....

Q. Did you say anything about the \$170 in rent ?

A. I don't know whether I said anything. By this time I was pretty fed up with Spano, to be truthful with you. I just didn't think things were being run correctly.

THE CHAIRMAN : Why ?

THE WITNESS: It made me feel bad that because they were colored we had to charge them \$ 170....
(Underlining supplied for emphasis)."

The evidence is likewise clear that the complainants were not treated as fairly by these respondents Spano and Mansor as was the white applicant in the matter of making known what other properties were

available for rent. The complainants were advised that only 2743 Quaint Street, Secane, Pennsylvania was available whereas the white applicant was told of six properties available for rent.

In the period November 30, 1967 through December 5, 1967 complainants inquired of Spano on four different occasions whether their application had been approved. On each such occasion the complainants were told that their credit had not yet been established and that the application had been forwarded to the owner but that no word had yet been received from the owner. The testimony discloses that the complainants' credit was known by Spano to be favorable on November 30, 1967 and that complainants' written application had not been forwarded to the owner until December 7, 1967.

The evidence pertaining to the actions of the respondent Spano and in particular of its president, Robert Graham, reveals clear violations of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act.

There is no doubt that on December 4, 1967, during the telephone conversation between Spano and Maillie, Spano disclosed the fact that the complainants were Negroes. Although this was denied by the agents of Spano who testified, the Hearing Commissioners believe the testimony of the owner Maillie as follows:

" Q. But the important question I want to ask, I am about to ask, and that is, was anything at all said to you during that conversation by any of these persons at Spano Real Estate Co., Inc. relating to the race of the complainants, Mr. and Mrs. Stancil ?

A. Yes.

Q. What, to the best of your recollection, was said to you ?

A. Well, to the best of my recollection, Mr. Bonnin called. I can't say how he said that the people were colored, he said they were non-white or colored, but I knew immediately that they were colored.

Q. Because of what they told you ?

A. That's right... (Notes of Testimony, page 299)."

It was testified by the owner at page 324 of the record that during the telephone call between him and Robert Graham, president of Spano, after learning that the complainants were Negroes, " I was told also that I would not have to rent to these people on the basis that these people have children which are not supervised because Mrs. Stancil works at night." Mr. Graham was questioned closely by the Hearing Commissioners as to why he had so suggested to the owner. He was evasive in his answers and did not explain to the satisfaction of the Hearing Commissioners why he went out of his way to suggest a means by which the owner, if he desired, might refuse to rent to the complainant Negroes. It was evident from the testimony of Spano's president that he had not ever been told that complainants' children would not be supervised ----- in fact neither he, Mrs. Mansor nor any other of Spano's agents had even taken the trouble to ask complainants whether their children would at any time be left alone and without supervision.

The testimony likewise revealed a course of conduct on the part of Spano which is in violation of Section 5(e) of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, the so-called "Aid and Abet Clause", as follows:

" It shall be an unlawful discriminatory practice for any person to aid, abet, incite, compel or coerce the doing of any act declared by this section to be an unlawful discriminatory practice, or to obstruct or prevent any person from complying with the provisions of this act" (Underlining supplied for emphasis)

Spano, by its president, admitted that (1) he had refused to return complainants' \$30.00 deposit until complainants would withdraw and discontinue the complaint they had filed with the Commission against Spano and Mansor, (2) he did not permit agents of Spano to be interviewed by the Commission during the investigation of any complaint filed against

Spano without his prior consent, and (3) for several years, Spano has been using a printed application for rental form containing a provision to the effect that in the event an applicant is refused rental of the given property for any reason whatsoever, the applicant may not file a complaint of discrimination with the Commission pursuant to the provisions of the Human Relations Act.


The facts proved at the hearing more than adequately sustain findings of discriminatory conduct by the respondents Spano and Mansor on account of race. The Hearing Commissioners also took into account the fact revealed at pages 365 et seq. of the record that since 1965, thirteen complaints alleging racial discrimination in the sale or rental of commercial housing have been filed with the Commission against Spano.

Finally, the Hearing Commissioners also recommend that a copy of the Commission's order be forwarded to the Pennsylvania State Real Estate Commission in accordance with the recent amendment to the Human Relations Act, being Act of October 11, 1967, P.L. _____, as follows:

" When the respondent is a licensee of the Commonwealth, the Commission shall inform the appropriate State licensing authority of the order with the request that the licensing authority take such action as it deems appropriate against such licensee...."




JOSEPH X. YAFFE, Presiding Hearing Commissioner



ARNOLD D. NEARN, Hearing Commissioner



EVERETT E. SMITH, Hearing Commissioner



ROBERT JOHNSON SMITH, Hearing Commissioner

COMMISSION'S DECISION

AND NOW, October 25, 1968, upon recommendation of the Hearing Commissioners, upon all of the evidence at the public hearing of this case, and in consideration of the findings of fact and conclusions of law by the Hearing Commissioners, the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission finds and determines that the respondents, Spano Real Estate Co., Inc. and Mary Jane Mansor, committed unlawful discriminatory practices under Sections 5(e) and 5(h) of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act in that they dealt in a discriminatory manner with the complainants, Gerald M. Stancil and Della Stancil, his wife, because of the race of the said complainants and further in that the respondent Spano Real Estate Co., Inc. engages in conduct intended to obstruct or prevent persons aggrieved by acts of racial discrimination from pursuing their legal rights in accordance with the provisions of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act.

FINAL ORDER

AND NOW, this 25th day of October, A.D. 1968, upon consideration of the foregoing Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Commission's Decision and pursuant to Section 9 of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act, it is hereby

ORDERED, by the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission

1. That the respondent, SPANO REAL ESTATE CO., INC., its officers, agents and employes, shall cease and desist from :

a. Dealing in a discriminatory manner with any individual desiring to rent or purchase commercial housing, because of such individual's race or color;

b. Disclosing the race or color of any prospective renter

or buyer of commercial housing to the owner thereof or to any other person who has listed such commercial housing with the respondent corporation; and

c. Obstructing or preventing any person, by written provisions in its printed forms or otherwise, from filing a complaint or otherwise proceeding in accordance with the provisions of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act.

2. That the respondent, MARY JANE MANSOR, shall cease and desist from dealing in a discriminatory manner with any individual desiring to rent or purchase commercial housing, because of such individual's race or color.

3. That the complaint against the respondent, JOHN T. MAILLIE, ~~be marked terminated on the ground that after a finding of probable cause~~ by the Commission, the matter was adjusted amicably with the said respondent prior to the public hearing in this case.

4. That the respondent, SPANO REAL ESTATE CO., INC., its officers, agents and employes, shall take the following affirmative action which, in the judgment of the Commission, will effectuate the purposes of the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act :

a. Issue to all officers, agents, representatives and employes, written instructions explaining that the Pennsylvania Human Relations Act prohibits the disclosure of the race of an applicant for commercial housing to the owner or other person who has listed such commercial housing with respondent corporation, and advising each such person of his or her individual responsibility for compliance with that

Act and his or her obligation to make such compliance meaningful and effective. Copies of such instructions signed by the said persons individually and acknowledging receipt and understanding thereof shall be transmitted to the Commission by the respondent corporation;

b. Forthwith discontinue the use of any of its printed forms, including its form known as "Application and Affidavit for Rental Lease", which contain language to the effect that in the event the application is refused no charges or complaints of any nature will be filed with any agency whatsoever by said applicant;

c. Forthwith return to the complainants, Gerald M. Stancil and Della Stancil, his wife, the thirty (\$30.00) dollars deposit posted by said complainants with the respondent corporation as a deposit on account of the rental of premises 2743 Quaint Street, Secane, Pennsylvania; and

d. Notify the Pennsylvania Human Relations Commission at its principal office at 1401 Labor and Industry Building, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120, in writing, within fifteen (15) days of the date of service of this Final Order, as to the steps the respondent has taken or intends to take to comply with each ordered provision hereof.

PENNSYLVANIA HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION

By

Harry Boyer
HARRY BOYER
Chairman

ATTEST :

Edward M. Green
EDWARD M. GREEN
Secretary